

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 00487 01 OF 02 291033Z

12

ACTION EUR-08

INFO OCT-01 SS-14 ISO-00 NSC-05 NSCE-00 L-01 PM-03 SP-02

INR-05 CIAE-00 DODE-00 SSO-00 INRE-00 ACDA-10 RSC-01

SAM-01 SAJ-01 /052 W

----- 077286

O R 290932Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 248

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 GENEVA 0487

LIMDIS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE PFOR XG

SUBJ: CSCE POLICY-HUMAN CONTACTS INTRODUCTORY TEXTS

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: SOVIET DELEGATION IS PRESSING VERY HARD TO GET EARLY AGREEMENT ON BASKET III HUMAN CONTACTS INTRODUCTORY TEXT DURING NEGOTIATING SESSIONS LIKELY TO MEET DAILY FROM FRIDAY, JAN. 31, AND IS VERY ANXIOUS TO HAVE OUR COOPERATION. PRIOR TO CHRISTMAS BREAK, DEPARTMENT AUTHORIZED US TO ACCEPT INFORMALLY AND PROVISIONALLY THE FRENCH LANGUAGE VERSION OF THIS TEXT. HOWEVER, THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE VERSION, WHICH ALSO HAS THE STATUS OF AN ORIGINAL TEXT AND NOT RPT NOT MERELY A TRANSLATION OF THE FRENCH, USES WEAKER LANGUAGE IN SEVERAL PLACES. MOREOVER THREE AMENDMENTS TO THE FRENCH TEXT HAVE BEEN PROPOSED BY NATO ALLIES. US POSITION WILL HAVE SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON FINAL OUTCOME OF CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE AND DELEGATION REQUESTS GUIDANCE. END SUMMARY.

2. THE DEPARTMENT (STATE 276712) AUTHORIZED US TO ACCEPT "MENTAL REGISTRATION" OF THE HUMAN CONTACTS INTRODUCTORY TEXT, BASED ON A DELEGATION TRANSLATION OF PARA 6 AMENDED IN GENEVA 7527). HOWEVER, THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE VERSION  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 00487 01 OF 02 291033Z

DIFFERS SIGNIFICANTLY IN SEVERAL PLACES, AND IS ALMOST

ALWAYS WEAKER THAN THE FRENCH--SIGNIFICANTLY SO IN A COUPLE OF CASES. MOREOVER, THREE ALLIES HAVE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO STRENGTHEN FRENCH TEXT STILL FURTHER. PRECISE TEXTUAL COMPARISONS AND TEXTS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS ARE GIVEN AT END OF THIS MESSAGE.

3. SOVIETS CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN THAT THE TEXT IS DELICATELY BALANCED AND THAT THE RUSSIAN VERSION CANNOT BE CHANGED IN ANY WAY, BUT THEY PROFESS TO BE RELAXED ABOUT THE ENGLISH AND TOEHR TRANSLATIONS. THEY CLAIM MOREOVER THAT THE FRENCH-RUSSIAN DIFFERENCES ARE A MATTER OF STYLE OR TASTE. THIS LATTER IS CERTAINLY NOT REPEAT NOT TRUE, ALTHOUGH ALL OF THE DIVERGENCES DO NOT RUN IN THE SAME DIRECTION (IN ONE MINOR CASE AT LEAST, THE RUSSIAN VERSIONS SEEMS TO BE STRONGER).

4. THE NATO DELEGATIONS ARE WORKING OUT THEIR POSITIONS ON THIS TEXT BUT ARE SPLIT IN SEVERAL WAYS. THE MAXIMALIST GROUP( NETHERLANDS, BELGIUM, CANADA) WANT TO ALIGN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE TEXT ON THE STRONGER FRENCH VERSION AND THEN TO AMEND THE FRENCH TEXT IN WAYS CITED BELOW. MOST OTHERS, INCLUDING THE FRG AND THE UK, FAVOR AN ALIGNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN VERSION ON THE FRENCH BUT DO NOT REPEAT NOT SUPPORT THE THREE AMENDMENTS. THE FRENCH AND THE DANES CAN LIVE WITH THE PRESENT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FRENCH AND RUSSIAN ORIGINALS BUT WOULD NOT OBJECT IF THEY COULD BE BROUGHT CLOSER TOGETHER. BECAUSE OF THESE DIVIDED COUNSELS, THE US POSITION WILL BE IMPORTANT IN INFLUENCING THE WESTERN GROUP. AT THE SAME TIME, POSITION WE ADOPT ON THIS CONTENTIOUS ISSUE, EVEN WITHIN CONFINES OF NATO CAUCUS, WILL BERY QUICKLY LEAK TO THE SOVIET DELEGATION.

5. WE SEE FOUR POSSIBILITIES FOR THE US POSTION:  
(A) INSIST ON BRINGING THE SOVIET TEXT INTO LINE WITH THE FRENCH AND ALSO SUPPORT THE THREE ALLIED AMENDMENTS. THIS WOULD PUT USIN SHARP CONFRONTATION WITH THE SOVIETS AND SHOULD NOT, WE BELIEVE, BE SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED;  
(B) JOIN THE ALLIED MAJORITY WHICH WISHES TO RECONCILE THE TWO TEXTS, BRINGING THE RUSSIAN  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 00487 01 OF 02 291033Z

VERSION INTO LINE WITH THE FRENCH TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE BUT WILLING IN THE LAST ANALYSIS TO SHOW FLEXIBILITY ON DETAILS. OUR SUPPORT WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF STIFFENING THIS ALLIED POSITION AND THUS MIGHT DELAY CONSIDERABLY RESOLUTION OF THIS ISSUE, GIVEN THE STUBBORNESS SHOWN BY THE SOVIETS SO FAR. EVEN IF WE TAKE A LOW PROFILE IN CSCE NEGOTIATING SESSIONS, OUR SUPPORT FOR THE

ALLIES WOULD QUICKLY BECOME KNOWN TO THE RUSSIANS, WHO WOULD BE HIGHLY DISPLEASED, PARTICULARLY BECAUSE THEY SEEM TO BELIEVE THEY WILL BE ABLE TO BEAT DOWN ALLIED PRESSURES FOR ANY SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE VERSION. HOWEVER, WE COULD EXPLAIN TO SOVIETS THAT CSCE TEXTS WILL BE APPROVED AT HIGH LEVEL AND WE BELIEVE DIFFERENT LANGUAGE VERSIONS MUST CONFORM. MOREOVER, WE FEEL OBLIGED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT CLEAR PREFERENCE OF MAJORITY OF ALLIES ON THIS ISSUE;

(C) RECONCILE THE TWO TEXTS, BUT TRY ESSENTIALLY TO SPLIT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE FRENCH AND RUSSIAN VERSIONS. THERE WOULD BE SOME GRUMBLING FROM THE FRG AND THE OTHER ALLIES. THE SOVIETS WOULD ALSO BE QUITE ANNOYED--THOUGH LESS SO THAT IF WE CHOSE (B) ABOVE. THIS COURSE WOULD ALSO SPIN OUT THE NEGOTIATIONS, BUT AGAIN LESS SO THAN OPTION (B);

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 00487 02 OF 02 291054Z

12

ACTION EUR-08

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SS-14 NSC-05 NSCE-00 PM-03 SP-02 L-01

INR-05 CIAE-00 DODE-00 ACDA-10 SAM-01 SAJ-01 SSO-00

INRE-00 RSC-01 /052 W

----- 077494

O R 290932Z JAN 75

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WAHSDC IMMEDIATE 249

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AUSMISSION NATO 2846

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 GENEVA 0487

LIMDIS

(D) ACCEPT THE STATUS QUO, WITH THE EXISTING INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN THE FRENCH AND THE RUSSIAN TEXTS, AS THE FRENCH AND DANES ARE WILLING TO DO. PRESUMABLY IN THIS EVENT WE WOULD WANT THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION TO CONFORM TO THE FRENCH VERSION. IF WE TOOK THIS POSITION, MOST OF THE

STARCH WOULD GO OUT OF THE ALLIES POSITION,  
WE BELIEVE, AND SOVIETS WOULD GET THEIR WAY  
RATHER QUICKLY. HOWEVER, THIS WOULD NOT PLEASE  
THE GERMANS IN PARTICULAR, WHO ARE NERVOUS ABOUT  
DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE RUSSIAN AND WESTERN LANGUAGE  
VERSIONS OF KEY TEXTS. IT WOULD ALSO BE BAD DIPLOMATIC  
PRACTICE AND SET AN UNFAVORABLE PRECEDENT  
FOR THE CONTROVERSIAL CSCE ISSUES THAT STILL LIE  
AHEAD.

6. WE FAVOR OPTION (B) ABOVE AND WILL FOLLOW THAT COURSE  
UNLESS OTHERWISE INSTRUCTED. WE WOULD OF COURSE TAKE  
VERY LOW KEY APPROACH IN CSCE SESSIONS AND CAREFULLY EX-  
PLAIN IN ADVANCE TO THE SOVIET DELEGATION WHY WE ARE UNABLE TO  
SUPPORT THEM ON THIS ISSUE. IN OUR CONVERSATIONS WITH  
THE SOVIETS AND OTHERS TO DATE WE HAVE TAKEN THE POSI-  
TION THAT THE DEPARTMENT WOULD LIKELY EXPECT US TO  
WORK TO ALIGN THE TWO TEXTS AND HAS SO FAR GIVEN US  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 00487 02 OF 02 291054Z

AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT MENTAL REGISTRATION, BASED ON AN  
ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE FRENCH, NOT REPEAT NOT THE  
RUSSIAN VERSION.

7. FOLLOWING PARAS LIST MOST SIGNIFICANT DISCREPANCIES  
BETWEEN FRENCH AND RUSSIAN VERSIONS. ENGLISH VERSION  
OF FRENCH TEXT IS DRAWN FROM CSCE SECRETARIAT TRANSLATION,  
NOT RPT NOT FROM OUR INFORMAL TRANSLATION EARLIER  
CABLED TO DEPT. WE ARE SENDING BY FOLLOWING SEPTTEL FULL  
TEXT OF SECRETARIAT TRANSLATION. RUSSIAN  
TEXT IS DRAWN ALMOST ENTIRELY FROM TRANSLATION PREPARED BY  
DEPT'S. DIVISION OF LANGUAGE SERVICES.

8. PARA 1 OF INTRODUCTORY TEXT, FRENCH VERSION, READS:  
QUOTE: THE PARTICIPATING STATES, CONSIDERING THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF CONTACTS TO BE AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT IN  
THE STRENGTHENING OF FRIENDLY RELATIONS AND TRUST AMONG  
PEOPLES UNQUOTE. IN THE SOVIET VERSION "ESSENTIAL" IS  
RENDERED AS "IMPORTANT".

9. IN PARA 2, THE FRENCH VERSIONS READS "DESIROUS OF  
IMPROVING THEIR EXISTING PRACTICES IN THIS SPIRIT".  
HERE, THE RUSSIAN VERSION RENDERS THE WORDS "DESIROUS  
OF IMPROVING" BY "STRIVING TOWARD PERFECTION OF ". MOST  
WESTERN DELEGATIONS FIND THE RUSSIAN VERSION OBJECTIONABLE BE-  
CAUSE IT CONVEYS IMPRESSION THAT EXISTING  
PRACTICES ARE ALREADY GOOD AND REQUIRE ONLY SLIGHT  
ADJUSTMENTS.

10. PARA 3 OF THE FRENCH VERSION READS AS FOLLOWS:

"RESOLVE TO DEVELOP, WITH THE CONTINUANCE OF DETENTE, THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE CONTINUING PROGRESS IN THIS FIELD". IN THE RUSSIAN VERSION THIS IS RENDERED AS: " GUIDED BY THE DESIRE TO APPLY THEIR EFFORTS, AS DETENTE DEVELOPS, WITH HE AIM OF FURTHER PROGRESS IN THIS FIELD". COMMENT: THE RUSSIAN TEXT IS VIEWED AS MAKING FURTHER PROGRESS ON HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS CONDITIONAL UPON FURTHER PROGRESS IN EAST-WEST DETENTE. IN THE FRENCH TEXT, THE LINK IS MORE AMBIGUOUS. MANY WESTERN COUNTRIES DO NOT WISH TO SUBSCRIBE TO A STATE-MENT THAT IMPLIES ACCEPTANCE OF DIRECT LINKAGE (AS IN CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 00487 02 OF 02 291054Z

RUSSIAN VERSION) BETWEEN PROGRESS ON HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS AND THE STATE OF EAST-WESTPOLITICAL RELATIONSHIPS. END COMMENT.

1. PARA 6 OF THE TEXT IN ITS FRENCH VERSION, READS: "DECLARE THEMSELVES RESOLVED TO TAKE SUITABLE MEASURES TO THESE ENDS AND TO CONCLUDE ARRANGEMENTS AMONG THEMSELVES AS MAY BE NEEDED, AND AFFIRM FORTHWITH THEIR INTENTION TO APPLY THE FOLLOWING". IN THE RUSSIAN VERSION, THIS PASSAGE READS: "DECLARE THEIR READINESS TO UNDERTAKE TOWARDS THESE ENDS MEASURES WHICH THEY CONSIDER APPROPRIATE AND, IF NECESSARY, CONCLUDE AGREEMENTS AMONG THEMSELVES, AND AT THIS TIME EXPRESS THEIR INTENTION TO PROCEED WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION O THE FOLLOWING". COMENT: RUSSIAN VERSION IS OBVIOUSLY WEAKER THAN THE FRENCH TEXT BECAUSE OF USE OF WORDS "MEASURES WHICH THEY CONSIDER APPROPRIATE". END COMMENT.

12. IN ADDITION, THREE ALLIES HAVE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FRENCH VERSION OF THIS TEXT. IN PARA 3, THE DUTCH HAVE SUGGESTED THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE, WHICH WULD UNAMBIGUOUSLY BREAK THE LINKAGE BETWEEN DETENTE AND FURTHER PROGRESS IN HUMANITARIAN FIELDS: "FULLY ENDORSING THE SPIRIT OF DETENTE AND RESOLVED TO DEVELOP THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE CONTINUING PROGRESS IN THIS FIELD". IN PARA 5, CANADIANS WIDH TO CHANGE CONTROLLING VERB ("MAKE IT THEIR AIM TO FACILITATE, ETC") AND HAVE SENTENCE BEGIN "WILL FACILITATE FREER MOVEMENT, ETC., FINALLY, BELGIANS PROPOSE TO CHANGE CONCLUDING PHRASE OF PARA 6 ("AND AFFIRM FORTHWITH THEIR INTENTION TO APPLY THE FOLLOWING") TO MAKE IT READ "AND EXPRESS THEIR INTENTION TO BEGIN NOW TO APPLY THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS." DALE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** TEXT, HUMAN RIGHTS, COLLECTIVE SECURITY, BASKET III, NEGOTIATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 29 JAN 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** SmithRJ  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975GENEVA00487  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750032-0766  
**From:** GENEVA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750111/aaaaajof.tel  
**Line Count:** 274  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** LIMDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** LIMDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** SmithRJ  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 28 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <28 APR 2003 by ElyME>; APPROVED <23 OCT 2003 by SmithRJ>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE POLICY-HUMAN CONTACTS INTRODUCTORY TEXTS  
**TAGS:** PFOR, XG, US, CSCE, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006